

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending and rejected. Claims 7 and 17-20 are being canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10 and 16 are being amended. Claims 1-6 and 8-16 remain pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In section 3, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-11, 14 and 16-20 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz. Aziz discloses a system for controlling an extensible computer system. A virtual server farm is created out of a computing grid. Allocation and control of the elements in the virtual server farm are performed by a control plane connected to all computing, networking and storage elements in the computing grid through special control ports. The control plane comprises a control mechanism hierarchy that includes one or more master control process mechanisms communicatively coupled to one or more slave control process mechanisms. The one or more master control process mechanisms instruct the slave control process mechanisms to establish virtual server farms by selecting subsets of processing and storage resources. Salkewicz discloses a method in which IP packets are routed within a first ISP's domain from a single network device with a first database. The first database includes addresses of the first ISP. IP packets are also routed within a second ISP's domain from a single network device with a second database. The second database, which is separate from the first database, includes addresses of the second ISP.

Independent claims 1 as amended recites "at least two subsystem management systems for controlling configuration of at least two of the router, the virtual LAN switch and the FC switch, "an integrated service management system communicatively coupled to the at least two subsystem management systems and for controlling configuration of the at least two subsystem management systems," and "a customer portal application communicatively coupled to the integrated service management system and enabling a customer to issue configuration requests to the integrated service management system." Similarly, independent claim 16 as amended recites "receiving a first request in an integrated service management system from a customer to change a configuration of a first service subsystem in an integrated storage and networking system," and "receiving a second request in the integrated service management

system from a customer to change a configuration of a second service subsystem in the integrated storage and networking system.” Neither Aziz nor Salkewicz discloses a method of enabling a customer to issue multiple configuration requests to an integrated service management system for configuring at least two service subsystems. This enables a total automated response in an integrated storage and service system to a customer request. Although embodiments may include user intervention, this system enables automatic configuration and reconfiguration of the system, including configuration of a VPN, VLAN switches, FC switches, etc. without user intervention and/or enables configuration of the system including a VPN from a single location in response to a customer request. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1, independent claim 16, and dependent claims 2, 3, 5-11, 14 and 16 which depend from claim 1 are patentable for at least this reason.

In section 4, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Akahane and Poisson. Since neither Akahane nor Poisson discloses a method of enabling a customer to issue configuration requests in an integrated service management system, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

In section 5, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Kim. Since Kim does not disclose a method of enabling a customer to issue configuration requests in an integrated service management system, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.


In section 6, the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Blumenau. Since Blumenau does not disclose a method of enabling a customer to issue configuration requests in an integrated service management system, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

In section 7, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Aziz in view of Salkewicz and further in view of Yamamoto. Since Yamamoto does not disclose a method of enabling a customer to issue configuration requests in an integrated service management system, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 which indirectly depends from claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-9-04  
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.  
600 Hansen Way  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043  
Telephone (650) 856-6500  
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

By   
Marc A. Sockol  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,823

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on  
Date: Dec. 9, 2004 By: Cathi L.G. Thoorsell  
Cathi L.G. Thoorsell